REMARKS

Entry of this amendment and favorable reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 10, 19 and 22 have been amended. Claims 1-3, 6-12, 15-19, and 22-26 are pending. Support for the amendments can be found in the application as filed, for example on pages 8, 10 and 12 and corresponding Figures. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of two separate combinations of references, Walmsley/Gormish and Walmsley/Sekiya, were maintained. It is respectfully urged that these rejections are no longer applicable due to the amendments of the independent claims made herein. The pertinence of the amendments and corresponding lack of teaching/suggestion in these references is briefly explained below.

Before discussing the amended claims, it is desired to address remarks appearing in the final Office Action. It is stated that the remarks made by Applicant regarding the lack of motivation to combine Walmsley and Gormish were not directed to the alleged motivation proffered in the preceding Office Action. Firstly, the presence or absence of motivation is a question that must be decided based on all relevant material in the references, not just whatever specific pieces the Office Action may have focused on, and there is no assertion that the points raised in the previous response were not relevant. Secondly, it is respectfully urged that the previous remarks do indeed address the supposed motivation, which was stated to be that the use of Gormish's technique would prevent re-use in another environment. The paragraph spanning pages 16 and 17 of the previous response specifically states that the use of Gormish's technique would not prevent unauthorized re-use of a print cartridge any more than Walmsley's authentication technique already does, and goes on to explain why. The point of the previous remarks is that that there is no evidence in these references that the supposed benefit would be obtained, and there certainly is no explicit suggestion in the references for the proffered combination. Applicant

does not acquiesce to the view that there is motivation to combine the teaching of these two references, and specifically reserves the right to offer all pertinent arguments in an appeal if such should become necessary.

More generally, Applicant does not acquiesce to any of the rejections set forth in the final Office Action. However, the claim amendments herein are offered in the interest of advancing prosecution toward allowance and issuance.

With respect to the current amendments, the independent claims as amended recite that the vendor data and first magic code are pre-programmed into a memory of the module, and obtained by reading them from the memory. Additionally, the serial number of the module is unique to the module when the module is from an approved vendor, as is the second serial number (of a second module) to which the serial number is compared for purposes of detecting a module having a duplicated serial number and therefore not being from an approved vendor.

It is respectfully submitted that Walmsley does not show the use of a pre-programmed first magic code. The Office Action has pointed to col. 24 lines 55-60 of Walmsley for pertinent teaching, but this section is seen to describe that an untrusted chip encrypts a random number and a data message and returns the encrypted value (along with the data message itself) to a trusted chip. Thus, the encrypted value is generated during the authentication process by the untrusted chip, and is not pre-programmed into the untrusted chip and obtained by simply reading it from memory. This distinction is made to emphasize that the claimed module is different from, and more easily copied than, the chips of Walmsley. The claimed module has the first magic code pre-programmed into an externally readable memory, whereas the chips of Walmsley include encryption keys and encryption logic enabling them to generate the encrypted value during the authentication process. Walmsley neither teaches nor suggests that the encrypted value that is passed to the trusted chip during authentication be a value that is simply pre-programmed into a memory of the untrusted chip. In all cases, Walmsley requires active participation of untrusted chip in generating

encrypted values used in the authentication process. Moreover, as previously pointed out, Walmsley cannot be concerned with cloning of the authentication chip itself, because otherwise Walmsley would not place an encryption key in it. Refer to col. 29, lines 1-10 of Walmsley, for example.

Based on the above description of the shortcomings of Walmsley, it should be clear that the combination of Walmsley and Gormish is not applicable to the independent claims of this application as amended.

It is further submitted that Sekiya does not show the use of serial numbers that are unique to hardware modules in the disclosed configuration management technique. Sekiya's "version number" is shared by all individual modules manufactured according to a particular version specification. As noted in the previous response, such a version number would be of substantially no use in detecting clone modules, and of course such is not the purpose of Sekiya (nor indeed of Walmsley with which Sekiya has been combined). It is submitted that the independent claims as amended clearly distinguish themselves from the configuration management technique of Sekiya, and therefore the combination of Walmsley and Sekiya is no longer applicable to these claims.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this Application should be in condition for allowance. A Notice to this affect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this Response, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' Representative at the number below.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3661.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-2900, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

James F. Thompson, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 36,699
Bainwood, Huang & Associates, L.L.C.
Highpoint Center
2 Connector Road
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-2900
Facsimile: (508) 366-4688

Attorney Docket No.: CIS01-25(4997)

Dated: April 14, 2006